DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 130 545 FL 008 181

AUTHOR	Stansfield, Charles
TITLE	Boulder Moves Ahead: An Evaluation of the English as a Second Language Tutorial Program of the Boulder Valley Public Schools, During Its First Year of Operation: 1975-76.
INSTITUTION	Boulder Valley School District RE-2, Boulder, Colo.
SPONS AGENCY	Colorado State Dept. of Education, Denver.
PUB DATE	15 Jun 76
NOTE	56p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Bilingual Education; Bilingual Students; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); Inservice Teacher Education; Language Proficiency; *Language Programs; Parent Attitudes; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Student Evaluation; Teacher Attitudes; *Tutorial Programs; Tutors
IDENTIFIERS	Boulder Valley Colorado Public Schools; Colorado (Boulder)

ABSTRACT

The evaluation of the first year of the English as a Second Language Tutorial Program of Boulder Valley Public Schools included on-site observations, interviews with coordinators and teachers, a linguistic evaluation of each student (elementary and secondary levels), a classroom teacher's questionnaire, a parents' questionnaire, and a tutor's reaction form. Detailed findings of the evaluation are presented. Some of the major conclusions are: (1) the program is of high quality; (2) there is a critical shortage of materials; (3) more consideration should be shown the individual tutor in designing the teaching schedule; and (4) more inservice training should be provided, particularly to overcome the negative attitudes of some classroom teachers toward non-English-speaking students. The following appendices are provided: (1) the classroom teacher's questionnaire, with a number of teacher comments; (2) the ESL tutor's reaction form; (3) the parents' questionnaire; (4) a description of the Peace Corps Oral Proficiency Interview, used to evaluate the students; and (5) a list of program personnel. (SW)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED130545

BOULDER MOVES AHEAD

An Evaluation of the English as a Second Language Tutorial Program of the Boulder Valley Public Schools, during its First Year of Operation: 1975 - 76.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Submitted to the

Colorado State Department of Education

by

THE BOULDER VALLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT RE-2

6500 E. Arapahoe

Boulder, Colorado, 80302

June 15, 1976

CHARLES STANSFIELD

External Evaluator

FL008181

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Formation and History of the Program	1
Inservice Training	3
Evaluation	6
Classroom Teacher's Questionnaire	8
E.S.L. Tutor's Reaction Form	12
Parent's Questionnaire	29
The Linguistic Evaluation	32
Evaluation of Secondary Students	32
Evaluation of Elementary Students	35
Summary and Conclusions	36
Bibliography	39
Appendix A (Classroom Teacher's Questionnaire)	40
Appendix B (E.S.L. Tutor's Reaction Form)	44
Appendix C (Parents Questionnaire)	47
Appendix D (Peace Corps Oral Proficiency Interview)	49
Appendix E (Program Personnel)	53

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

Introduction

The Boulder Valley School District is located in the southern portion of Boulder County. The district consists of the towns of Broomfield, Boulder, Gold Hill, Jamestown, Lafayette, Louisville, and Nederland. It is the site of the University of Colorado, the National Bureau of Standards, and the National Center for Atmospheric Research as well as several other agencies and industries attracting personnel of an international nature.

Due to these and other factors, there is a sizeable number of students whose language is other than English. This situation creates a two-fold problem for the district: many students do not understand the English language adequately to progress normally in the public schools, and few teachers employed by the Boulder Valley Public Schools are specifically trained to teach this type of child.

Formation and History of the Program

During the fall of 1975, the Boulder Valley Public Schools conducted its Annual Census of students whose primary or home language is other than English as prescribed by House Bill 1295 of the 1975 General Session of the legislature of the State of Colorado, otherwise referred to as the Bilingual and Bicultural Act. As these children were not currently enrolled in a bilingual education program, they were eligible for tutorial assistance under the "NON-ENGLISH SPEAKING TUTORIAL PROGRAM" cited in Section 22-24-119 of the Act which provides for TUTORIAL GRANTS to school districts for the instruction of non-English speaking students. The district submitted a request for a TUTORIAL GRANT to the Colorado State Department of Education on October 24, 1976, after identifying 116 eligible students. These students are portrayed below in Table I.

TABLE 1

NON ENGLISH DOMINANT CHILDREN ENROLLED IN B.V.P.S. BY NUMBER AND LANGUAGE

Language	Number
Arabic	7
Cambodian	2
Chinese	2
Danish	1
French	6
German	3
Greek	1
Hebrew	1
Hindu	2
Iranian	2
Italian	2
Egyptian	1
Janpanese	8
Korean	3
Nigerian	2
Portuguese	1
Spanish	41
Turkish	1
Vietnamese	30
Total languages 19	Total children 116

Pursuant to submission of its proposal, the district received a grant in the amount of $11,758.00 from the Colorado Department of Education. Applications for the position of E.S.L. Tutor were then processed and a total of four tutors were then selected from among the applicants. Mr. Roger D. Martinez, Jr., of the Boulder Valley Public Schools was designated Program Coordinator and Dr. Charles Stansfield of the University of Colorado was designated Program Evaluator.

The tutors selected were Mrs. Bettye Paltridge, Mr. Peter Callas, Miss Deborah Anderson, and Mr. Anthony Lopez. Mrs. Paltridge has prior experience in the district as a volunteer tutor. Mr. Callas holds a B.A. degree and speaks Spanish, Greek, and Chinese. Miss Anderson holds a B.A. degree and speaks Spanish, as does Mr. Lopez. None of the tutors contracted are certified teachers. Each of the above tutors taught 30 class

hours per week except Mrs. Paltridge who taught 20 hours per week. All tutors were paid a salary of $4.50 per class hour.

Tutors were assigned to schools as follows:

Deborah Anderson	Aurora 7 Elementary School	6
	Boulder High School	7
Peter Callas	Burke Elementary School	3
	Casey Junior High School	1
	Columbine Elementary School	6
	Centennial Junior High School	1
Anthony Lopez	Lafayette Middle School	6
Betty Paltridge	Martin Park Elementary School	4
	University Hill Primary School	2
	University Hill Intermediate School	2

The amount of instruction each student received varied according to the needs of each student. Many students did not receive any instruction since, in the opinion of the regular classroom teacher, additional tutoring was not needed. Other students received only occasional tutoring amounting to one hour per week or less. Normally, each child who received tutoring was tutored between 40 minutes and one hour per day. Three students at Lafayette Middle School each received three hours of E.S.L. instruction per day.

Tutoring began on December 9, 1975, and continued throughout the school year. The district provided three inservice training sessions to tutors from its own discretionary funds. The cost of this evaluation was also paid out of district funds, since no monies for such were received from the Colorado Department of Education.

Inservice Training

Professional development of the tutors was provided for and encouraged. Dr. Charles Stansfield of the University of Colorado conducted 3 four-hour workshops on E.S.L. techniques and methodology at the Boulder Valley

Public Schools Administrative Office on 6500 East Arapahoe. The first of these was held in January and dealt with the nature of language and how it is learned. Tutors were shown techniques for the teaching of pronunciation and the causes of pronunciation problems were discussed. Emphasis was placed on the development and presentation of minimal pair drills.

The second session was held in February, 1976, and dealt with the teaching of syntactical pattern to students. The rationale for the teaching of syntax was discussed and methods of conducting a pattern practice were demonstrated. Tutors were also involved in the construction of different kinds of pattern drills.

The third formal inservice training session was held during the month of May. During this session the nature of the final linguistic evaluation was discussed and tutors were shown how to carry on and grade an oral proficiency interview.

Approximately one hour of each of the above sessions was devoted to an unstructured discussion of the pedagogical problems tutors had encountered in the schools. It was found that such discussions were especially productive as the tutors learned a great deal about methods and materials from each other. Also, during this period it was possible for Mr. Martinez and Dr. Stansfield to clarify certain aspects of the operation of the public schools which seemed strange to the tutors as uncertified teachers.

During the second inservice session the tutors agreed to meet on their own to further discuss their problems and possible solutions. Betty Paltridge volunteered the use of her home for the first meeting which was held on February 24. All tutors attended, as did Dr. Stansfield. Each tutor brought along those materials which he or she had found to be especially useful. It should be said lack of materials and lack of familiarity with materials, was one of the most critical problems faced

this year, especially at the beginning of the year. Teachers also discussed their most perplexing students and asked for suggestions from each other on how to handle their educational and emotional problems.

The second informal inservice session was held at the home of Peter Callas on March 16. At these sessions it became increasingly evident that an unexpected, but necessary part of the job of each E.S.L. tutor was that of social worker. The tutors were asked to handle students with learning disabilities, emotional and discipline problems. This normally involved the necessity of visiting with the children's parents at their home. While some tutors felt frustrated at first at seeing their responsibilities with the children expand to include their whole day and sometimes their evenings, it was helpful for them to see that other tutors had encountered the same problems. It was apparent at such meetings that the district had been fortunate in finding part-time para-professional personnel who were so concerned about their students and so committed to their well being.

One of the highlights of the inservice program was the opportunity to visit the Intensive English Center at the University of Colorado, during March. On this visit, arranged by Dr. Stansfield, the tutors met Mrs. Jean Engler, director of the center, and observed several E.S.L. classes being taught by experienced E.S.L. teachers. They were able to discuss methods and materials with the teachers during post-class discussions, and form impressions of the efficacy of certain techniques by observing the reactions of students to them. Although the tutors judged the Intensive English Center to be a situation entirely different from their own (since it enrolls adults only), they did feel they profited a great deal from their visit.

EVALUATION

Evaluation of the program was conducted by an outside evaluator, Dr. Charles Stansfield of the University of Colorado. The use of an outside evaluator theoretically results in more candid responses by all concerned, especially district employees, than responses obtained through an internal evaluation carried out by persons at the administrative office.

The evaluation consisted of several components. These included on-site observation of each tutor by the evaluator, interviews with coordinators and teachers at the building level, a linguistic evaluation of each student, a classroom teacher's questionnaire, a parents' questionnaire, and a tutor's reaction form.

The on-site observations were carried out early in 1976. The evaluator visited Deborah Anderson on January 23, at Aurora 7 Elementary School, where he spoke with the principal, Mr. Englund, the reading specialist, Mrs. Hutcheson, and the special education teacher, Mrs. Sherman. All noted that the tutor had come in relatively unprepared but with tremendous enthusiasm. It was their opinion that she was doing a fine job.

Betty Paltridge was visited on February 10, at Martin Park Elementary School, where she was observed by the evaluator teaching children from Vietnam and France. The students seemed to be progressing well and it was obvious that they were heavily involved in a planned program of E.S.L. instruction. It was not possible to talk with the principal at this school since he was out of the building at the moment.

Peter Callas was observed on March 5, at Centennial Junior High. It should be noted that neither the principal nor the assistant principal knew that there was an E.S.L. tutor in their school, even though he had been working there for the past three months. The special education teacher, Mr. Wilkie, has been assigned to coordinate Pete's activities and apparently

he was the only one who was familiar with his work or his presence. Mr. Wilkie had a very favorable opinion of Pete's work at the school. He stated that he felt Pete should concentrate on the teaching of reading, which would be a prerequisite to written expression. Wilkie's opinion is typical of that of numerous educators who see the acquisition of reading as being the primary skill to be taught by the E.S.L. teacher or anyone else. Once this is learned, it is believed that other school problems will begin to solve themselves. While such a generalization may have validity for students whose native language is English, it does not take into account that the non-English speaker must learn to speak English before he can learn to read it with any degree of fluency. Once the speaking skill has been acquired to a sufficient degree, the receptive use of it in reading a second language is normally acquired quite rapidly. On the other hand, learning to read without knowing how to speak is a slow cumbersome process. Once this process is complete, there is little transferral to speaking, which must then be learned almost from scratch.

At Centennial, Pete was working with a 13-year-old Korean boy, trying to instill in him the confidence to speak in English. There seemed to be a very close rapport between tutor and student.

Tony Lopez was also observed on March 5, at Lafayette Middle School. He was helping a 15-year-old foreign exchange student from Mexico with his science lesson. Tony translated a difficult chapter on glaciers into Spanish and they discussed its content together. The evaluator, himself a professor of Spanish, was much impressed by Tony's command of the language.

The evaluator then spoke with Mrs. Valdez, the Spanish teacher and regular E.S.L. teacher for the school. Mrs. Valdez stated that having to help students with other courses, instead of systematically teaching them English was a constant problem for her and for Tony. She also stated that

the E.S.L. program in the school needed more materials. She was very positive about the tutor, Tony Lopez.

The building principal, Mr. Dave Aragon, was most positive about the tutor's work. He was impressed by Tony's ability to relate to students as a peer, while at the same time exhibiting a professional demeanor. He stated that other teachers in the school had mentioned to him the positive academic influence Tony was having on some linguistically different children. In the words of the principal, "He not only tutors, but talks to them about the importance of school."

Classroom Teacher's Questionnaire

A questionnaire for regular classroom teachers of those students enrolled in the E.S.L. program was developed in order to provide feedback on the success of the program. Forty-five questionnaires were sent out with 36 (80%) being returned to the evaluator. Many contained additional comments which are portrayed in Appendix A. The results, depicted in table two, indicate that on the whole the program was perceived as being quite helpful.

Question

How do teachers perceive the language acqusition process?

Findings

The results indicate that most teachers believe that language skills are acquired and should be taught in the following order: listening, speaking, reading, writing. This is indeed the process which language acquisition normally follows, both for first and second language learners. Therefore, teachers showed that they generally understand the process.

Nevertheless, there was substantial variation among the responses, indicating that there are many who do not understand this. Ten teachers listed a skill other than speaking as being first in importance and acquisition, and six teachers who turned in the questionnaire did not respond to

TABLE II

Classroom Teachers' Questionnaire

English as a Second Language Program (Lau)

1. Please number in order of importance (1-4) the acquisition of those skills you feel are of most immediate value to your ESL students.

		LC	OP	R	W
Oral production	1	71%	21%	10%	3%
Reading	2	20%	50%	26%	4%
Writing	3	6%	16%	55%	17%
Listening Comprehension	4	--	14%	10%	71%

2. Do you feel that your linguistically different students benefit from ESL instructions?	Yes	100%
	No	
3. Do you feel that your ESL students should attend ESL classes when there is a conflict in scheduling?	Yes	88%
	No	12%
4. Do you ever contact the ESL teacher to discuss your ESL students?	Yes	81%
	No	19%
5. Do you think there should be an ESL tutor in this building next year?	Yes	97%
	No	3%
6. Do you feel that your ESL students received sufficient ESL instruction this year?	Yes	64%
	No	36%
7. Is the ESL program of any help to you?	Yes	97%
	No	3%
8. Do you think the ESL tutor should also be available to assist students in learning other courses in which they are enrolled?	Yes	100%
	No	

9. Are there any comments you would like to make regarding the ESL program?

Please mail this form to Dr. Charles Stansfield
Dept. of Spanish
University of Colorado
Boulder, 80302

the question at all. This indicates that some have never considered the language acquisition process and when asked to give a response about it, they could not form one. Several of the questionnaires corroborate this in that the respondent drew a large question mark next to the first question.

The teachers responses indicate that listening comprehension is perhaps the most useful skill to students. If a student understands what the teacher is saying, he is capable of learning in the regular classroom. Once the student can understand, he is ready to begin speaking. When he can do this, he can participate more fully in the class. When the student can speak, he is then linguistically ready to read English. Efforts to teach students to read before speaking usually fail, since the student is being forced to perform at a level greater than his linguistic proficiency. Reading is followed by writing, which is greatly facilitated by the fact that the student has already learned much of the orthography and formal sentence structure.

Question. Did teachers find that their students benefitted from the E.S.L. program.

Findings. One hundred percent of those responding to this question agreed that their students had benefitted from the E.S.L. instruction they received. Therefore it appears that this program brings noticeable improvement and benefits.

Question. Do teachers believe that students should attend E.S.L. classes even when there is a conflict in scheduling?

Findings. Eighty-seven percent of those responding felt that E.S.L. was so important that students should attend even if it caused them to miss other basic classes and activities.

Question. Does the classroom teacher discuss his student's progress with the E.S.L. tutor?

Findings. Seventy-nine percent of those responding stated that they do. Nonetheless, the comments of the tutors, both throughout the year and on the Tutor's Reaction Form, indicate that such contracts were usually infrequent. Only a few teachers went to the trouble to inform themselves of the tutor's activities and work jointly with them.

Question. Did the teachers feel that the program should be continued?

Findings. The teachers showed strong enthusiasm for the program in their response to question 5. Ninety-seven percent felt the program should be continued. The one teacher who answered negatively was opposed to the program's existance on philosophical grounds as evidenced by his writing on the questionnaire the following comment:

> "If the district funds are bing used for this, let's drop it. While it could be valuable for the student, it is still the student's problem to learn English and I don't think the district should be paying for it."

In spite of the above comment, a strong endorsement of the program by teachers is apparent.

Question. Did the teachers feel that the program offered students sufficient supplementary assistance?

Findings. Sixty-three percent of the teachers responding to question 6 felt that the present program is adequate. The remaining 37% felt that it is inadequate. The large number of negative responses again indicates general teacher enthusiasm and concern for the E.S.L. program. No other question received so many negative responses.

Question. Does the individual classroom teacher believe that he, himself, benefits from the E.S.L. program?

Findings. The responses to question 7 indicate that the teachers overwhelmingly agree that they also benefit from the program. Apparently, the teachers feel that they could not take the time to tutor these children

individually, as was indicated in several comments written on the paper. They also feel that the program makes teaching easier for them by keeping students current with assignments and providing individual tutoring in the content areas.

Question. Do teachers believe that the E.S.L. tutor should also provide assistance to students with their regular school work?

Findings: Without exception the teachers feel that the E.S.L. tutor should assist them in teaching content courses. This poses a considerable problem to the E.S.L. tutors in that their primary responsibility is to teach the English language. Most feel that the responsibility for teaching content courses rests with the classroom teacher and that they simply do not have sufficient contact with the student to accept this additional responsibility. Since the Lau program was principally funded to employ English tutors rather than regular subject matter teachers, it appears that in the future the limitations of the tutors responsibilities should be made clear to all building personnel.

Question. What other comments did the teachers have?

Findings. Additional comments by the teachers are reported in Appendix A. They were generally most favorable, with many teachers making strong statements about the need for such a program. Also, some of the comments complimented the work of individual tutors. This would indicate that the tutors contracted by the district carried out their responsibilities in a very dedicated fashion.

E.S.L. Tutor's Reaction Form

This form was used to gather considerable information about many aspects of the program, including attitudes toward working conditions of the tutors, instructional materials, training, supervision, number of students taught, out of class contacts, contacts with parents, and recurring problems.

The reaction form was divided into two parts. The first ten questions called for fixed responses, while questions 11 through 19 permitted open-ended responses. The form may be examined in Appendix B.

The following analysis portrays the individual responses of tutors. The comments of the four tutors are reproduced in full along with a summary statement by the evaluator.

Question. How did the tutors rate their work load?

Responses. Excellent: 1 Good: 2 Fair: 1 Poor: 0

Comments.

--Each student had sufficient time each day to learn English. Older children had 45 min. and younger children had 30 min. each as their attention span was shorter.

--Initially poor--too many students, scheduling difficulties, overloaded with students who didn't really qualify for the ESL program. Finally fair to good, however, I felt that my high school students required more time than I was able to give them.

--Because of a lack of materials at first, I had to spend much time preparing. Things fell in place.

--I would've like to help more students but priorities were established on the basis of who couldn't speak at all as to those who could but needed help in reading or writing English.

Summary. All but one tutor appeared satisfied with the work load. Complaints were minor and varied according to situation. There was some concern that students were not receiving enough attention and that not all students could be reached by the program. Also, it again appears that tutors are being asked to be more than an E.S.L. tutor.

Question. How did tutors rate their class schedule?

Responses. Excellent: 1 Good: 1 Fair: 2 Poor: 0

Comments.

--Most teachers suggested a favorable working schedule, only one became upset if her students missed P.E., art or recess. Therefore the schedule had to be worked around her.

--Initially it was very chaotic with so many students. By spring quarter, my schedule was set, but class time was insufficient in trying to meet the needs of the students.

--Commuting is hard--but necessary.

--All of the students in the same building.

Summary. There was some dissatisfaction with class schedule, again due to various causes. The fact that tutors must commute from school to school like itinerant teachers was admittedly a hardship, especially since they were not paid for this travel. Also, the number of students taught by each student was disparate, ranging from 16 to seven. Only one tutor had all of his students in the same building, which is a definite work advantage.

Question. How did the tutors rate their instructional materials?

Responses. Excellent: 1 Good: 0 Fair: 0 Poor: 3

Comments.

--Excellent material available for elementary level. Once you know what and where it is. Favorite material provided by speech therapist and language disability specialist.

--School district did not provide any materials specifically for the ESL program. Materials were gathered from non-school district resources. Later on in the year, a few materials were available through the district.

--Because the program is just starting, we had none to speak of.

--There were none for middle school children. Made various attempts at Ed Center library and ordered books, but they never came.

Summary. Because the program began in December, as soon as state funds were appropriated, the district was unprepared in terms of instructional materials, manipulatives, and software. Teachers were told to begin tutoring without experience, a curriculum guide, or texts. Most began by obtaining reading materials from the reading specialist and the special education teacher. As time went on, tutors located E.S.L. textbooks at the University of Colorado's bookstore, library, and Intensive English Center. Some books were ordered for the district, but these did not come

in until the end of the year, and unfortunately laid unrecognized in a box for some time. Since there was no standard curriculum or text this year, teachers responses were understandably negative about this matter. Copies of the Magic of English Workbook for all students have been ordered for next year, as has a small library of professional literature on the teaching of English as a Second Language.

Question. How did the tutors rate their supervision?

Responses. Excellent: 0 Good: 0 Adequate: 3 Inadequate: 1

Comments.

--I enjoyed almost total freedom to use and discard favorable and unfavorable material.

--Supervision was not on a district level, but delegated to individual school administrators, who didn't have the time to devote to the ESL program, because of the magnitude of their responsibilities. I felt that there was very little supervision.

--Sessions with Dr. Stansfield were very useful. Mr. Martinez offered support--but more detailed supervision would be helpful.

--Roger Martinez never came to evaluate and criticize my performance.

Summary. Supervision tied with instructional materials for the lowest rating among those aspects queried in the questionnaire. It was the policy of the program coordinator to place responsibility for supervision of the tutors with the building principal. As a result, little direct supervision was given. Mr. Martinez visited the tutors only if they specifically requested it so only two of the four tutors were observed by district personnel. The general feeling that there should be more supervision was also felt by the evaluator who was asked by several of the tutors if he could stay to observe them in each of their classes.

It seems apparent that building level administrators do not feel that they have anything to offer in the way of pedagogical expertise in the area of English as a Second Language. Therefore, in the future, some on-site observation and supervision should be planned at the district level.

If the coordinator's present duties would not permit this, then perhaps someone should be contracted to supervise as has been done in several other Colorado school districts.

Question. How did the tutors feel about their inservice training?

Responses. Excellent: 0 Good: 2 Adequate: 2 Inadequate: 0

Comments.

--I feel that I needed more inservice training to learn techniques and gain more self confidence.

--Because this was the first year of the program and most of the tutors were novices, I felt that more training and curriculum development was needed to provide a program with continuity. The two sessions we had were helpful, but a more intensive training would have been beneficial. Mr. Stansfield was extremely willing to help us out and I appreciated this very much.

--Earlier sessions on phonology and morphology were aimed at higher levels--not as useful as later bull sessions and visist to CU.

--A step by step process of language development as far as English is concerned was never really given. Also having children of different ages for each tutor requires different techniques. Therefore, it would be wise to have one tutor at a time.

Summary. The two inservice training sessions presented by Dr. Stansfield were generally viewed as helpful. However tutors felt that more inservice was needed, especially in the first year of the program. The tutors felt that they profited greatly from their occasional informal meetings in which they discussed different problems they were having. It appears that in the future, some provision should be made for the planned continuation of such meetings (perhaps through released time) and that presentations by external specialists should be made at the beginning of the year in the form of pre-service workshops.

Question. How did the tutors regard their salary?

Responses. Excellent: 0 Good: 2 Fair: 1 Poor: 1 N.R.

Comments:

--Tutors teaching ESL are making higher salaries elsewhere.

--The hourly wage was sufficient, but being paid as a part-time employee had its drawbacks. After investing many hours every week in preparation, it seemed a bit unreasonable to lose wages because of students not attending class, holidays, and other official school closures.

--More than fair for our training--but not princely.

--It should be 8 hours a day, not 6. Hourly pay is excellent except for those who drove from school to school.

Summary. The tutor's earned a salary of $4.50 per class hour. There was no allowance made for preparation time, which is always considerable during the first year of teaching. Tutors complained that time spent traveling from school to school was generally not recognized and that school holidays meant a loss of income to them. It was also mentioned that tutors in other districts are earning more. While it is true that some districts are paying $5.00 per hour, others are paying less than $3.00. During the coming year, the B.V.P.S. will increase compensation for tutors to $5.00 per hour, a factor which should produce more favorable attitudes toward salary. Nevertheless, the average teacher, with a salary of some $13,000 plus substantial fringe benefits, is much better compensated for his teaching than a tutor. If certified personnel are hired and paid as tutors, some feelings of bitterness and/or jealousy will undoubtedly develop. Since none of the tutors hired by the district this year were certified unemployed teachers, this situation did not occur. (In other districts, it did.) Generally, it seems that tutors attitudes toward their salary were rather positive.

One tutor mentioned that if a student was absent she was not given credit for teaching. This situation should be rectified in the future, since student attendance is a matter beyond the tutor's control.

Question. How did the tutors rate their assistance from building administrators?

Responses. Excellent: 1 Good: 2 Adequate: 1 Inadequate: 0

Comments.

--More active support could have helped. Only one principal inquired as to how the students were progressing. The other thought I was there merely to keep the children happy until they returned to their country.

--In general, I found the building administrators to be very co-operative and willing to offer their assistance when possible. Mr. Valdez, at Boulder High School, was very concerned about the ESL students and was especially helpful and supportive of the ESL program.

--Principals at half my schools were concerned and helpful. Larger junior high schools didn't even know I was there.

-- Dave Aragon and Max McMillan are most sensitive and understanding. They were always there to help and made me feel like a part of the faculty and not just a tutor.

Summary. Reactions to the quality of building level assistance were quite positive, although it should be pointed out that the assistance could more accurately be described as moral support, concern, and helpfulness. Also, substantial differences were apparent between buildings.

Question. How did the tutors rate their assistance from classroom teachers?

Responses. Excellent: 2 Good: 1 Adequate: 2 Inadequate: 1
(Two tutors responded twice)

Comments.

--More active support and interest would have helped.

--Many of the teachers were unaware that the ESL program existed. At the high school level, the number of teachers involved with each student made it difficult to maintain close contact with the students' specific problems. Some teachers offered suggestions and pointed out areas where their students needed help. For the most part, I charted my own course with each student.

--Some classroom teachers were good, others merely turned children over to me and left it at that.

--All of the teachers went out of their way to help my students here in Lafayette which says something for the teachers.

Summary. Assistance from classroom teachers varied considerably. Some were always helpful and concerned, inquiring as to the student's progress

and the tutor's activities, while others were either unaware or aloof. Some tutors found it difficult to respond to this question because of this variation. For this reason, tutors checked more than one category.

Again it would appear that some type of inservice session for classroom teachers should be held early during the year. This would inform teachers as to the existance and function of the tutors in the school and help them to be accepted by school personnel. Hopefully the outcome would be more of a team effort between tutor and teacher. This should especially be the goal where the program exists in elementary schools.

Question. How extensive were tutors contacts with parents and how did tutors rate these contacts?

Responses. Excellent: 2 Good: 1 Adequate: 0 Inadequate: 1

Comments.

--I have visited the Vietnamese family twice and phoned three times. They are sponsored by a local church who has taken on the responsibility of providing social and business contacts--and private tutoring on an informal basis. I found that it is difficult for an outsider to enter this closed circle. I have suggested several TV programs which might have been of interest to the children and asked "Mom" to help with spelling lists. There is a cordial relationship between us and they have requested help. Both French families have been a great treat. We have coffees and dinners together, share mutual problems concerning work and home. I visit children when they are sick (during tutor time--this is an advantage of having one child per session) and we exchange pictures and birthday dates. It is a very affectionate relationship.

--Limited contact was made with only a few parents and guardians. Individual conferences with the parents at the beginning and the end of the year might be helpful in the future. Also, a number of the parents did not speak English very well.

--Parents were very responsive to my meeting them.

--I became a social worker, not only helping the students but also their parents espcially when they needed my help at home.

Summary. All but one of the tutors had extensive contacts with parents, both during and in addition to class time. This is most laudable and

indicates a high degree of dedication on the part of the tutors contracted this year. As one of the tutors aptly described, the job at times involved being a social worker, not only helping the children, but their parents as well whenever a family crisis called for it. Tutors performed a variety of tasks of this nature, including serving as translator for the parents, babysitter, spokesman, and all-around good friend. Again, tutors were not paid for these out of class contacts, even though such contacts are apparently unavoidable given the nature of the subject and the nearly one-to-one student-teacher relationship.

Question. How do tutors feel they can best teach E.S.L.?

Responses. As a tutor: 4 As a teachers aide: 0 As an ESL teacher: 0

Comments.

--The one-to-one or two-to-one situation is quite effective when dealing with the individual problems of the student, especially on the high school level where it is important to establish trust and develop a good rapport in order to overcome inhibitions.

--I could be any one of these.

Summary. There is some discussion in E.S.L. circles as to what is the best administrative design for E.S.L. instruction. In particular, many people feel that E.S.L. classes should be held at a single school in the district with children being bussed to that school. On the other hand, the B.V.P.S. tutors believe that they should remain tutors in order to do their job most effectively. One mentioned the need for a one-to-one pupil-teacher ratio in order to help the student overcome his inhibitions about speaking English. While this evaluation is not meant to be an investigative study of the optimum administrative design, it should be noted that the opinion of the Boulder tutors is that the tutorial situation is best.

Question. Describe five things that were accomplished during the first year of the program.

Comments.

--1) All students can speak survival English.
2) Some students gained sufficient amount of confidence in themselves which enabled them to participate verbally in class and on the playground.
3) I feel that the foreign students are proud of their ability to speak English regardless of their limited capabilities.
4) I was informed that most foreign schools require English instruction therefore ESL while in America will give some a "head-start" and others practice using what they have already learned.

--1) Knowledge of various materials and how to make use of their potential in adapting them to the students' needs.
2) Initiated an understanding of the American culture, with my students.
3) Lowered inhibitions and stimulated students to learn and use the English language.
4) Increased students' proficiency in English language skills.
5) Established a good rapport with my students which enabled us to work together more effectively, as well as to deal with personal and cultural problems.

--1) Most of my children gained a considerable freedom in using English in the course of the year. Not as much as I liked, but all seemed to learn and moreover be anxious to learn more by the end of the year.
2) Most of my students had a positive attitude towards speaking English. They weren't contrasted or bothered by error.
3) By means of trips and walks, many students learned a lot about their surrounding environment. American society.
4) I learned much--a great accomplishment--about children. How to approach them and what to avoid.

--1) Instilled confidence in students.
2) Instilled a sense of participation in school.
3) Inspired the students to learn English outside of class as well.
4) Students work harder now.
5) Have gotten students interested in school work.

Summary. All of the teachers felt that they had taught their children how to speak a minimum of English. Some referred to this minimum as "survival" English while others referred to it as "conversational" English. The teachers felt that they had also increased their students' motivation to learn English, something which should have a very positive effect on their

future educational growth. Teachers felt that they had taught their students something about American society and had facilitated their adaptation to that society and its educational system. Finally, the tutors felt that they learned something about teaching children especially the teaching of English as a Second Language.

Question. What were the persistent problems faced by tutors during the first year of the program?

Comments.

--Intense shyness in Vietnamese and kindergarten children to the point of being sent out of a particular class because one refused to answer specific questions. She understood the teacher's question and knew the answer, I'm sure, but was unable to reply because there had been no personal relationship built up. A few teachers were unsympathetic and unfeeling towards the adjustment problems of the foreign children and expected as much verbally as from American children. In my opinion this is an unreasonable expectation until the children become "Americanized."

--Lack of materials--difficulty in finding stimulating, educational ESL resources, especially for high school students. Difficulty establishing a curriculum with a logical progression. Deciding which students qualified for the ESL program. Teachers and counselors unfamiliar with ESL requested my assistance with students who were having problems with English language skills. (Reading problems on the elementary level, and an American Indian on the high school level). On the high school level, tutoring students in their coursework detracted from providing the continuity of an intensive ESL program. However, coursework tutoring has been extremely helpful for a student's ability to survive in the classroom and earn credit toward a diploma. Responsibilities of the ESL tutor were not clearly defined. As a result, I served as a liaison between students and their teachers and counselors, dealing with class scheduling, class problems, designing independent study reading programs for high school credit, and writing independent study contracts for students attending the Adult Basic Education ESL program. Difficulty assessing a student's English proficiency, primarily in the beginning. High school students who had studied English prior to their arrival in the U.S. had some knowledge of reading, but oral production skills were severely limited.

--Lack of materials to teach from. I ended up gearing my tutoring to help children with classwork rather than spend most of the time working on structure of English. Lack of definition of role: teachers were not quite sure how to fit me in. Class schedules and lack of conference rooms--some schools had frequent--too frequent--assemblies and trying to rearrange schedules was harrassing and unpleasant. Minor problems: where

to put books, going from school to school induced logistics problems. The usual job hazards.

--No materials. Expected to discipline students when they cut up in someone else's class. No effort by some teachers to make students feel welcomed. Students are ignored by non-Spanish speaking teachers.

Summary. Lack of instructional materials seemed to be the major problem during the first year of the program. This was due to the fact that the tutors were hired once state funds were received, and before significant planning for the program began. As the year progressed some materials did arrive and more were being ordered at the close of the year, but no set curriculum had yet been established.

Another persistent problem was the obstacles placed before the tutors which prevented them from teaching English as a Second Language. In some cases they were expected to teach reading to non-readers who did not qualify for the program. In other cases, tutors were expected to teach content courses to the students rather than E.S.L.

Finally, it appears that insensitivity to students on the part of some of the teachers was a significant problem for the tutors. While teachers such as the one who sent a student out of class for not responding should not be considered typical, the tutors remarks do reflect definite cultural insensitivity on the part of some. The fact that some teachers responses to the Classroom Teacher's Questionnaire were hostile to the program as a whole corroborates the existance of this insensitivity.

Questions. What do teachers believe should be done to alleviate the above-mentioned problems?

Comments.

--1) Assign small room to ESL students and tutor to be used on an everyday basis. Empty kindergarten rooms, although a great source of materials, are too much of a visual delight and tend to be disconcerting.

2) Remind teachers how intimidating a language disability can be to a youngster--how cut off and alone they feel.

3) Concentrate primary effort on instruction of refugees and permanent residents. Most visitors from foreign countries come from a middle-class environment and can afford private lessons if parents feel it is sufficiently important.

4) Administration and teacher awareness programs concerning objectives, schedules, space requirement and materials.

5) Publish list of similar activities known to be taking place in community to facilitate broader range of information exchange among active tutors and for teachers.

6) Publish student achievement goals and criteria early in program.

Suggestions:
1) A list of materials that have been used successfully.
2) A private room to work in.
3) Monthly meetings of tutors.

--Compile a list of resource materials, ideally, an ESL resource center. Familiarize the tutors with resource people to contact for information on specific ESL problems (i.e. John Hoffman of the Migrant Mobile Unit). Request a curriculum guide. Possibly the R.O.C.K. Curriculum Guide, Milton Book Co., Dallas, Texas. Initial evaluation of students' proficiency in the English language. I feel this two-pronged approach is necessary in that it facilitates a student's ability to cope with a new learning environment and somewhat reduces the frustration level associated with continuing his/her education in a second language.

Define the responsibilities of the tutors. Obtain a proficiency test.

Write up an explanation of the ESL program for the teachers and counselors in Boulder. They need to familiarize themselves with the objectives of the program. Hold periodic inservice training sessions. In addition to the 30-hour teaching week, I feel that an extra three to five hours per week should be added to allow for teacher and counselor conferences and class preparation.

--Before a tutor arrives to a school, the supervisor should set down the responsibilities of the tutor to the school's teachers. Teachers with ESL students should be aware of the student's difficulties and should try to make them feel at ease.

Have materials ready.
Get a list from the Intensive English Institute and acquire the books when program begins.
Take the tutors to this program to learn techniques.

Summary. The tutors felt that something should be done to change teachers attitudes toward the problems of non-English speaking students. Some

mentioned that teachers needed to be made aware of what it is like to be in such circumstances, indicating that once the teachers understood, they would show more empathy toward students. Previous studies (i.e., the Fall, 1975, study of teacher attitudes toward bilingual education), have shown that many teachers are openly unsympathetic to cultural differences, in spite of the fact that Boulder is in many respects an international community. Moreover, attitudinal workshops have been conducted for teachers in the district at district expense, and these apparently have had little effect. While the evaluator offers no patent solutions to this problem, perhaps a more direct approach in dealing directly with problem teachers should be considered.

Tutors also felt that those responsible for the program should inform teachers at the beginning of the year as to the nature and limitations of the ESL tutorial assignment. Principals were informed this year, but apparently it was not communicated to the teachers. Most probably this is a matter which could be clearly explained at the preservice orientation held each fall.

Tutors suggested that a materials library be established. This should be located at the central office and a list of materials available compiled and distributed. They also felt the need for a standard curriculum, textbooks, and curriculum guide. The district is presently working on a curriculum guide and has contracted one of this years tutors to develop it in consultation with others during the summer months.

Tutors also felt that many instructional problems could be eliminated via use of appropriate evaluation and assessment instruments. One tutor suggested that the oral proficiency test be given at the beginning as well as at the end of the year. Diagnostic testing would seem most appropriate

for this task, although proficiency testing could provide some general information about the student's overall needs in E.S.L. instruction.

Question. To what extent have the tutors had out-of-class contacts with tutors?

Comments.

--I have driven Vietnamese students and interpreter home from school several times. I have included French kindergarten child from another school to sit in and become acquainted with the Vietnamese kindergarten students. A few of the students have visited my home for lunch. I have visited them when they were ill. I "babysat" one student whose mother had gone back to France to a funeral. My husband has made plans to take the older students for a ride on his motorcycle and I have promised to take smaller ones on a ride with our neighborhood policeman in a patrol car.

--I invited a few high school students over for dinner, took students shopping, took them up to Flatirons Park, took them to the Boulder Public Library, and assisted an Iranian student in finding a different living situation.

--I drove many of my children home on a regular basis as well as field trips to stores, museums and the mountains.

--Every Saturday some of the students went to my house. I also attended baseball games with them, gave them rides home, and hand-me-down clothes and toys for their younger brothers.

Summary. The tutors responses indicate that all became very close with their students and took a personal interest in their well being. The tutors did many things for and with the students outside of the classroom, including the following: taking students home after school, taking them to visit stores, taking them to amusements, the mountains, etc., assisting the students families whenever they had problems, inviting students to their home, visiting the students' homes, and giving them occasional presents. While tutors earn only a fraction of a regular teacher's salary, they apparently show more genuine concern for the whole student than do most teachers.

Appropriate work space was another problem mentioned as needing remedying. Tutors did not like teaching one or two children in a large classroom, and would prefer a small cubicle where they could work with the students in a more personal environment. This is a useful and positive suggestion which can be carried out in the future if the coordinator has the principal of each building reserve such a space for each tutor.

Two suggestions were made regarding inservice training, both of which are quite valid. The tutors felt that workshops should be held more often and that regular monthly meetings between tutors should be scheduled. In addition, one tutor suggested that in the future all tutors observe classes at the Intensive English Center of the University of Colorado before beginning to tutor other students.

Question. How many students did tutors instruct this year?

Comments.

--Seven.

--Seven.

--Eight.

--Sixteen.

Summary. Tutors instructed a total of 38 students during the course of the year. The average number of students pertutor was about eight, although one tutor had twice that number. This figure does not seem excessive, although it is unevenly distributed.

Question. How many pupils were the tutors working with at the end of the year?

Comments.

--Seven.

--Seven.

--Seven.

--Ten.

Summary. At the end of the year tutors were instructing a total of 31 students. Not surprisingly, the largest drop in number of students receiving instruction was with the tutor who had the greatest number of students at the beginning of the year. This was probably due to the fact that the tutor was initially assigned several students that did not qualify for the program, but needed extra help in the area of English language arts. Eventually, the tutor was able to reduce her load to a number more in line with the loads of her colleagues.

Question. What teaching experience prior to assuming their new role, did the E.S.L. tutors have?

Comments.

--I have taught conversational English to foreign adults for four years. Therefore, I was accustomed to the sound of a foreign language and to the way they mispronounce words. The technique I used with adults on an intermediate level was very informal and comfortable. I suggested the subject matter agreeable to all and then led the discussion. My job was to correct verbs, tenses and sentence structure. During that time I worked as a volunteer at Burbank Jr. High explaining teachers' directions, teaching one youngster cursive writing, showing students how to use library and appropriate materials, coaching students for tests and oral reports and explaining or informing them about local dress and customs.

--None.

--None.

--Englewood Federal Youth Center tutor for Spanish speaking inmates.
T.A. for Chicano studies at C.U.
Bilingual aide at Columbine Elementary and tutor in political science, sociology, and Spanish (C.U.).

Summary. Only two of the tutors had any previous experience of a similar nature and these assignments were only marginally related to the tutors' present job. One had served as a volunteer tutor of E.S.L. with adults (substantially different from teaching E.S.L. to children), and the other had served as a general tutor for Chicano students at the University of Colorado and a brief period as a bilingual aide in a bilingual education

classroom. None of the tutors were certified teachers.

Question. What materials and sources of information did the tutors consult to assist them in organizing their teaching duties?

Comments.

--TESL Methodology:
1. Helping People Learn English, Earl Stevick.
2. Manual for the Volunteer as a Teacher of English, National Assoc. for Foreign Student Affairs.

--1. Teaching English as a Second Language, Mary Finocchiaro.
2. English as a Second Language, Phase Two, William Samuelson.
3. The Teaching of English to Immigrant Children, John and Francis Stoddart .
4. Conversational English for the Non-English Speaking Child, Nina Phillips.
5. Basic Helps for Teaching English as a Second Language, Betty J. Frey.
6. English 900.
7. English Sentence Patterns, Robert Lado
English Pattern Practices.
Vocabulary in Context.
8. Tape - Text
Surviving in English and .....
Instructional Systems Marketing Counsel.

--Linguistics books by Hacket, et al., were helpful.

Summary. Three of the four tutors did outside reading on teaching English as a Second Language in order to acquire a better understanding of what they were doing. This again speaks well for the professionalism demonstrated by the tutors in their first year on the job. It also indicates that tutors will take advantage of available materials. Because of this, it is probable that the E.S.L. materials center, suggested by several of the tutors, would be taken advantage of in the future.

Parent's Questionnaire

A questionnaire was mailed to parents of the 39 students receiving tutorial instruction under the program. The questionnaire consisted of ten questions which could be answered via a multiple choice response. It was decided to use this format since it was felt that many parents would be unable to express their opinions in English.

In spite of the multiple choice format of the questionnaire, only four parents responded by returning the questionnaire by mail. This would seem to indicate that a mailed questionnaire will not be returned and therefore should not be used in the evaluation of future programs for the non-English speaking. Possible reasons for this are varied. Obviously many parents do not speak or read English themselves. The possibility also exists that the parents of some non-English speaking children are accustomed to their children having problems in school, and therefore, tend to avoid contact with the school system. Finally, it is also possible that some of these parents are turned off by the school system. Or, it could be that they did not receive the questionnaire due to having moved during the school year without informing the school or the post office of the new address.

Nevertheless, the four parents that did respond reacted very favorably to the program. The questionnaire and its results are depicted on the following page.

Summary of responses to the Parent's Questionnaire

The parents who responded expressed highly positive impressions of the district Lau program. All were in agreement that it is important for their children to learn English. Half felt that their child should study E.S.L. only, while the other half felt that E.S.L. should be combined with other school subjects during the day. All of the parents were aware that their children were receiving E.S.L. instruction and all believe that this instruction improved their child's English skills. Such results speak favorably of the success of the program and indicate that it should be continued. Three-fourths of the responding parents said that they had met their child's tutor and the same number said that their child had mentioned the tutor to them in conversation at home. This would seem to corroborate

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARENTS

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAM (LAU)

1. Do you feel it is important for your child to learn English? — Yes 4 / No

2. How much time do you want your child to spend receiving instruction in English language skills?

All of the time	2
½ of the time	
¼ of the time	1
½ hour per day	1
none at all	

3. Did you know that your child was receiving instruction from an English as a Second Language tutor this year? — Yes 4 / No

4. Do you believe this tutoring has helped your child's English skills? — Yes 4 / No

5. Has your child ever spoken to you about his English tutor? — Yes 3 / No 1

6. Have you met your child's English as a Second Language tutor? — Yes 3 / No 1

7. Have you ever received an oral or written report from the English as a Second Language tutor on your child's progress? — Yes 2 / No 1 (1 N.R.)

8. Would you like to receive regular reports from the E.S.L. tutor on your child's progress? — Yes 3 / No (1 N.R.)

9. Do you believe the school has made a serious effort to meet your child's educational needs? — Yes 4 / No

10. Do you wish to make any comments regarding the English as a Second Language program? (Write below.)

--Peter is a good tutor. My son learned English and has improved very much.

--Que está muy bien.

--It is a great program, and Mrs. Paltridge, our children's tutor, is a wonderful teacher. I don't think Sophie and Catherine could have reached the level they have in English without her. She even came to our house to teach them when they were sick, and she always found ways to interpret them, and to make them want to express themselves in English. We are extremely thankful to her.

the close relationship between tutor and student which was apparent from analysis to the Tutor's Reaction Form.

Half of the parents said that they had received a report on their child's progress in English. This was most certainly an oral report since no written reports were issued this year. However, three-fourths of the parents stated that in the future they would like to receive regular written reports on their child's progress in English. All parents stated that they thought the district had made a serious effort to meet their child's educational needs, a fact which the district can take pride in.

The Linguistic Evaluation

Assessment of the students' language skills was carried out during the last week of May, 1976. All students at both the elementary and secondary levels were evaluated. Students at the elementary level were evaluated by means of the Bilingual Syntax Measure: English Edition. This evaluation was individually administered by Dr. Stansfield. Students at the secondary level, junior high and senior high, were evaluated via a modified version of the Peace Corps Oral Proficiency Interview. These will be described extensively below.

Evaluation of Secondary Students

Peace Corps Oral Proficiency Interview. This is the oldest and best researched measure of proficiency available today. The instrument was developed by the Foreign Service Institute for use in evaluating the oral proficiency of American diplomats working abroad. It was later adopted by other government agencies including the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, and the Civil Service Commission. Most

recently it was adopted by the Peace Corps which made minor changes on it. The Peace Corps then contracted with Educational Testing Service to administer it to all volunteers following their initial language training and again after completion of two years service in the field.

The Peace Corps Oral Proficiency Interview, which is further described in Appendix D, consists of a 20-minute oral interview with the interviewee on a one-to-one basis. The interview begins with simple information questions, such as Where are you from?, and proceeds to more personal questions such as Tell me what you think of rock music. The interviewer attempts to have the subject use different tenses by asking questions about the subject's past and future. During the conversation the interviewer decides at which of six levels of oral proficiency the subject's linguistic facility rests. After the interview he makes note of this level and it becomes part of a permanent record. The reliability of this procedure has been shown to be above .95 in numerous studies on the interview carried out over the years.

Since the Peace Corps interview is designed for use with adults, it was found that some aspects of the scoring criteria were not applicable for use with adolescents. For instance, for an adult to receive a rating of three, he must be able to converse on professional topics using appropriate fluency and vocabulary. Since public school students would not be expected to have to demonstrate the ability to converse on the job, such topics were not covered in the interview. Instead, the interviewer asked questions about the subjects each student was studying in school, and generally substituted school language for professional language in evaluating the student's performance. These changes were suggested by Dr. Stansfield during a four hour workshop which was presented to the tutors in May, 1976. The workshop dealt with the nature of the final evaluation and procedures for carrying out and scoring an interview.

Results of the Peace Corps Oral Proficiency Interview. The interview was administered to 14 junior and senior high students. This number was three less than the total number of secondary level students who received instruction. All students could not be tested due to absenteeism and class conflicts, both of which were prevelant at the end of the year. Of the 14 students who were interviewed, two scored at level 0 (practically no English), six scored at level 1 (survival skills only), four scored at level 2 (basic conversational skills), and two scored at level 3 (conversational and classroom English). A score at this last level indicates that the student is capable of functioning in a normal classroom with only occasional E.S.L. instruction. There are two additional proficiency levels, four and five, which refer to near-native and native proficiency respectively. Students with such proficiency would not need any further E.S.L. instruction. Students scoring at levels 0 and 1, are not capable of understanding what takes place in the regular public school classroom. These students should receive E.S.L. instruction only until they progress to level two. Students at level two can understand a fair amount of English, but are not capable of keeping up with or competing with native students in the public schools. Their command of English is insufficient for classroom discussion. These students need substantial E.S.L. instruction at least one hour per day, although they may be mainstreamed during the rest of the day. In some programs such as the one in Grand Junction, Colorado, students at this level receive one-half day of E.S.L. instruction. Students at level three need occasional E.S.L. instruction in order to assist them in continuing to improve their English skills. This instruction could occur for brief periods on a daily or weekly basis. As stated above, only two students attained this level of proficiency.

Therefore, the linguistic evaluation indicates that all the students receiving instruction in English as a Second Language this year will also need to continue it next year, and that many of them have not received as intensive teaching as was needed.

Evaluation of Elementary Students

Students enrolled in elementary schools were evaluated at the end of the year using the Bilingual Syntax Measure: English Edition published by Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich. Like the Peace Corps Interview, the Bilingual Syntax Measure (B.S.M.) was administered during the last week of May, 1976, to 14 students who were receiving instruction at that time. The test was individually administered to each student by Dr. Stansfield. Among the students who took the test, the scores ranged as follows.

Eight students scored at level 3 (survival English). These students will need substantial E.S.L. instruction during the coming year since a score of 3 on the B.S.M. is more or less equivalent to a score of 1 on the Peace Corps Interview in overall proficiency. Most of the students who scored at this level are Vietnamese refugees.

Two students scored at level 4 on the B.S.M. This is equivalent to a score of 2 on the Peace Corps Interview. Therefore, these students will need some E.S.L. instruction during the coming year although they can function in the classroom and communicate in English. Four students attained level 5 on the B.S.M. This is equivalent to levels three and four on the Peace Corps Interview. These students, although they may have yet to master English with the fluency of a monolingual speaker, are proficient in the language and will not need E.S.L. instruction during the coming year. Therefore, the results of the final evaluation indicate that

at least ten of the elementary school children who were still receiving E.S.L. instruction at the end of the year will need additional instruction next year.

Summary and Conclusions

During its first year of operation the E.S.L. Tutorial Program of the Boulder Valley Public Schools made considerable progress. The basic structure of the program was established. A coordinator and an evaluator were selected, inservice training was provided, tutors were hired and trained, and textbooks and supplementary materials were purchased. While the program was late in commencing due to the fact that funding did not come until November, the program did commence. While plagued with many problems, the teachers did fulfill their assigned roles and successfully tutored many students. Parents became aware of the program's existence and applauded the tutors' efforts. A final oral evaluation of nearly all students was conducted to the satisfaction of both the tutors and the evaluator, using instruments which had not previously been employed in the district. In addition, this in-depth progress report on the program was prepared and distributed.

The results of this evaluation have shown that there are still many areas where improvement is needed. There still seems to be a critical shortage of materials. Plans are underway to alleviate this by purchasing materials during the summer of 1976. There is a need for greater consideration of the individual tutor in designing the teaching schedule. Tutors did not like having to travel from school to school or having to tutor more than two students at a time. They also did not like being asked to assist with students whose problems were other than linguistic.

On this matter, greater efforts will need to be made in the future in order to insure that the role of the E.S.L. tutor is explained to and understood by building personnel. Tutors would prefer to earn a more substantial salary, although they are moderately satisfied with their present remuneration. More inservice training needs to be provided, especially at the beginning of the year. This should include information on techniques for conducting an initial assessment of students. Classroom teachers showed very positive reactions to the work of the E.S.L. tutors and provided strong supporting data for the need to continue the program. Nonetheless, a few teachers were antagonistic toward the presence of non-English speaking students in the schools, and the district's efforts to provide them with tutorial assistance. The tutors themselves listed classroom teachers' attitudes toward the pupils as one of their most consistent and frustrating problems. Therefore it seems that inservice training should be provided to teachers with non-English speaking students in order to make them more comfortable if not more sympathetic in dealing with these children.

The overall conclusion about the most important aspect of the program, the quality of the tutors and the instruction they imparted, is that it was of high caliber and worthy of considerable praise. This factor seemed apparent from the remarks made by the parents of children, the classroom teachers, building administrators, and the classroom observations of the program evaluator. Moreover, the many indications of the high level of personal commitment with which the tutors approached their jobs, i.e., evening meetings to discuss common problems, spending time with parents and children after class, reading books on methodology and searching for new materials, all reinforce the conclusion that the teachers, the most important factor in the instructional process, were both dedicated and effective.

Given the understanding that the problems mentioned by the tutors are problems which are typical of initial remedial programs, in general, and of the Lau program in Colorado in particular, the evaluator must conclude that the district's program was as successful as could reasonably be expected. Since most of this year's tutors are planning to continue in the same position next year, the outlook of an even better program in the future is good.

Charles Stansfield
University of Colorado

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Burt, Marina K., Heidi C. Dulay, and Eduardo Hernandez Chavez. Bilingual Syntax Measure. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich, 1975.

Educational Testing Service. The Peace Corps Oral Proficiency Interview. Princeton, New Jersey: E.T.S., n.d.

Hartford Public Schools. Hartford Moves Ahead: An Evaluative Report. Hartford, Conn.: Hartford Public Schools, 1974.

APPENDIX A

Classroom Teachers' Questionnaire

English as a Second Language Program (Lau)

1. Please number in order of importance (1-4) the acquisition of those skills you feel are of most immediate value to your ESL students.

   Oral production
   Reading
   Writing
   Listening Comprehension

2. Do you feel that your linguistically different students benefit from ESL instructions? Yes _____ No _____

3. Do you feel that your ESL students should attend ESL classes when there is a conflict in scheduling? Yes _____ No _____

4. Do you ever contact the ESL teacher to discuss your ESL students? Yes _____ No _____

5. Do you think there should be an ESL tutor in this building next year? Yes _____ No _____

6. Do you feel that your ESL students received sufficient ESL instruction this year? Yes _____ No _____

7. Is the ESL program of any help to you? Yes _____ No _____

8. Do you think the ESL tutor should also be available to assist students in learning other courses in which they are enrolled? Yes _____ No _____

9. Are there any comments you would like to make regarding the ESL program?

Please mail this form to Dr. Charles Stansfield
Dept. of Spanish
University of Colorado
Boulder, 80302

BOULDER VALLEY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. R-2, BOULDER COUNTY
P.O. BOX 11
BOULDER, COLORADO 80302
(303) 447-1010

May 3, 1976

Dear

As evaluator for the English as a Second Language Program of the Boulder Valley Public Schools, I wish to request a few minutes of your time to assist me in the end-of-year evaluation. It is necessary for the district to submit an evaluation report in order to comply with the requirements for funding under the state Bilingual Education Act.

As you can see the form is very brief, containing only nine questions. After completing the questionnaire, please return it to me in the enclosed envelope by May 25.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Charles Stansfield, Ph. D.
Evaluator, E.S.L. Program

CS:mns

Individual Classroom Teacher Comments

I think the program should be expanded. Also the building teachers should be familar with the program, possibly through an inservice in the fall. The classroom teachers can offer suggestions, supplies, materials etc. to the E.S.L. teacher, for her use.

Stephanie Vigil was enrolled in both the Educationally Handicapped Resource room and Debbie Anderson's program. I feel it wasn't the best use of Debbie's time because Stephanie's problems are more basically specific learning disabilities.

Many of our E.S.L. students arrive knowing no English. Zero, Nill. In other words, English is not a second language for them when they begin. They are often monolingual. This means E.S.L. is essential since the child can't learn any content in English.

Some students are not motivated to improve even with an ESL teacher. Somewant special treatment and do assignments only halfway without expending much effort on their own.

Did not deal with my Vietnamese and I know lang. of others.
Just that we need more fit.

Great!

Good job by Pete.

I wish the children I've had involved could have been involved sooner in the program.

If district funds are being used for this let's drop it. While it could be valuable for the student, it is still the students' problem to learn English and I don't think the district should be paying for it.

This program has been a great help to both students and teachers this year... and definately should be continued next year.

It is an absolute necessity and should take precedence over all other coursework. We reading teachers have far too many remedial American kids to work with and cannot even begin to help the foreign student by ourselves. For their own well being, (adjustment, etc.) these students need a strong ESL program. IEEP IT UP!!

If we are going to accept students at Boulder High who cannot speak English then a program of this nature is essential. I know of no school system anywhere else in the world who will accept students who cannot speak the native language.

More students in E.S.L. Programs.

Debbie Anderson is excellent!

What is available is good. More is needed!

The students that I had were having difficulty in the regular classroom. When Tony Lopez came and began spending time with my program and instructing the students accordingly--they responded favorably.
This is an important asset to our school and is needed for the coming school year.
Tony Lopez did an excellent job and the students communicated with him about their needs. He was very successful. I appreciated his help.

I feel a self contained program would produce better results in that the students would integrate faster into the regular school program.

This has been a very valuable help this year, and I would like to see it continued.

I feel for this first year -- my kindergarteners would have benefited more by being in a bi-lingual program (Viet Nam/Eng.) with other Viet Nam Children and a teacher that spoke both languages. They need the experience of <u>understanding</u> and <u>communicating</u>!

A very fine job was done this year for the child in my classroom.

I wish there had been more time for communication with the ESL teacher here at school. Most was done over the phone which was very limiting.

Vocabulary input to the Tutor previous to a new topic would make the classroom less frustrating. This is particularly applicable in K.

I feel that the tutor should try to go along with what the classroom teacher is talking about in class. Ex: spelling words, social studies and science words etc.

I felt the program was extremely beneficial to my class.

APPENDIX B

Boulder Valley Public Schools

E.S.L. Tutor's Reaction Form, Lau Program

How Would you rate your:

1. Work load? Excellent ___ Good ___ Fair ___ Poor ___

   Comments:

2. Class schedule? Excellent ___ Good ___ Fair ___ Poor ___

   Comments:

3. Instructional materials and equipment? Excellent ___ Good ___ Fair ___ Poor ___

   Comments:

4. Supervision? Excellent ___ Good ___ Fair ___ Poor ___

   Comments:

5. In-service training? Excellent ___ Good ___ Fair ___ Poor ___

   Comments:

6. Salary? Excellent ___ Good ___ Fair ___ Poor ___

   Comments:

7. Assistance from building administrators? Excellent ___ Good ___ Fair ___ Poor ___

   Comments:

E.S.L. Tutor's Reaction Form

8. Assistance from classroom teachers? Excellent ____ Good ____ Adequate ____ Inadequate ____

   Comments:

9. Contacts with parents? Excellent ____ Good ____ Adequate ____ Inadequate ____

   Comments:

10. How do you feel you would be most effective in the future?

    1. As an ESL tutor. _____
    2. As a teacher's aide. _____
    3. As an ESL teacher. _____

11. Describe as many as five things you believe you have accomplished during this first year of the program. (Use separate sheet if necessary.)

12. Describe as many as five problems which plagued you during this first year of the program. (Use separate sheet if necessary.)

13. Describe any solutions you feel may alleviate the above problems. (Use separate sheet if necessary.)

14. Describe to what extent, if any, you have had out of class contacts with pupils?

15. Indicate any other changes or suggestions you have for future operation of the E.S.L. program. (Use separate sheet if necessary.)

16. Exactly how many pupils did you tutor this year?

17. Exactly how many pupils were you tutoring at the end of this year?

E.S.L. Tutor's Reaction Form

18. Describe any previous teaching experience you may have had.

19. List any books (author and title if possible) on TESL methodology you read or consulted after you were hired.

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARENTS

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAM (LAU)

1. Do you feel it is important for your child to learn English? Yes_____ No _____

2. How much time do you want your child to spend receiving instruction in English language skills?

All of the time	_____
½ of the time	_____
¼ of the time	_____
½ hour per day	_____
none at all	_____

3. Did you know that your child was receiving instruction from an English as a Second Language tutor this year? Yes_____ No _____

4. Do you believe this tutoring has helped your child's English skills? Yes_____ No _____

5. Has your child ever spoken to you about his English tutor? Yes_____ No _____

6. Have you met your child's English as a Second Language tutor? Yes_____ No _____

7. Have you ever received an oral or written report from the English as a Second Language tutor on your child's progress? Yes_____ No _____

8. Would you like to receive regular reports from the E.S.L. tutor on your child's progress? Yes_____ No _____

9. Do you believe the school has made a serious effort to meet your child's educational needs? Yes_____ No _____

10. Do you wish to make any comments regarding the English as a Second Language program? (Write below.)

BOULDER VALLEY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. R-2, BOULDER COUNTY
P.O. BOX 11
BOULDER, COLORADO 80302
(303) 447-1010

May 3, 1976

Dear Parent:

As evaluator for the Boulder Valley Public Schools' English as a Second Language Program, I wish to request a few minutes of your time to assist me in our end-of-the-year evaluation. The information you furnish will aid the district in improving its efforts to meet your child's educational needs.

As you can see the enclosed questionnaire is very brief, containing only ten questions. After completing it, please return it to me in the enclosed envelope which is provided for your convenience.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Charles Stansfield, Ph.D.
Evaluator, E.S.L. Program

APPENDIX D

DESCRIPTION OF THE PEACE CORPS LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY INTERVIEW

Background

Although many Peace Corps trainees and Volunteers are acquainted with the language proficiency interviews conducted in host country languages, it seems desirable to provide you with some additional background on the interview technique, and the uses for which the results of these evaluations are intended.

The interview-conversation technique was developed by the Foreign Service Institute (FSI), and until 1969, the bulk of the interviews were administered for the Peace Corps by FSI staff. In the summer of 1969, the Peace Corps entered into a contract with Educational Testing Service (ETS) under which ETS assumed responsibility for the interview testing program as well as for a comprehensive review of Peace Corps language evaluation needs. By early 1970, certain other language evaluation techniques will be introduced on an experimental basis for some of the common languages. These new techniques will not replace the interview, but will provide supplemental information on the student's* language competence.

We will provide you with additional information on the new techniques as they become available; this leaflet has been prepared to describe the current interview procedure in some detail and to suggest ways in which the results of the interview might be most useful.

Scheduling of Interviews in the Course of Training and Service

For the most part, students will be asked to participate in three interviews during the course of their training and service: 1) on entry into the training program, 2) near the conclusion of training in the United States, and 3) at some point during in-country service.

General Structure of the Interview

The language proficiency interview consists of a 15-20 minute conversation between the student and either one or two ETS qualified interviewers. When two interviewers are present, one conducts the conversation while the second listens and takes notes. The listener may enter the conversation occasionally. When only one interviewer is present, he, of course, performs both these functions. The notes being taken are not necessarily notations of weaknesses; positive features of the student's performance are also recorded.

ETS is currently tape recording each language interview. These recordings are for research and development purposes, such as the training of new interviewers. They are for ETS use only, and do not make up any part of the student's official Peace Corps file.

Content of the Interview

The primary purpose of this face-to-face interview is to give the student an opportunity to demonstrate, in a realistic conversational situation, the extent of his spoken mastery of the host country language, as well as his ability to understand the spoken language. The interviewer, therefore, is not interested in "tricking the student," or finding out what he "doesn't know" in the negative sense. The interviewer makes every effort to put the student at ease, to engage him in interesting topics of conversation, and to lead him in gradual stages up to his maximum level of speaking proficiency.

The specific content of each interview is not fixed, and there may well be substantial differences from interview to interview in the topics discussed. It is therefore not useful for the student to try to anticipate details of the conversation based on the experience of others, or to attempt to "prepare" a conversation beforehand.

Although, as stated above, the interviewer does not cover the same topics in each conversation, he does in each interview attempt to determine the student's level of mastery in certain specific linguistic areas. These are:

Pronunciation and Accent

A pronunciation which is sufficiently accurate to avoid confusion as to the particular sounds which the student intends is important to effective communication, and this aspect of the student's speech is evaluated in the course of the conversation. Beyond this, the student's degree of command of a phonetically accurate pronunciation (the absence of obviously non-native elements of accent, intonation and phrasing) is also taken into account, though to a lesser degree.

*Throughout this leaflet, the term "student" will be used rather than the more cumbersome "trainee/volunteer."

Grammatical Accuracy

In the Peace Corps language training program, considerable emphasis is placed on the development of grammatical accuracy. Since structure is indeed the backbone of the language, entering into each sentence produced regardless of the particular topic or vocabulary involved, it is reasonable and desirable that the Peace Corps program stress the development of an accurate structural command of the language. Given a good structural control of the host country language, the student should be able to develop a broader vocabulary and to increase his level of fluency through practice in the field. It is doubtful, however, that the student will greatly increase his structural accuracy in the field, since the Peace Corps experience has been that extensive practice in a formal and controlled (i.e., classroom) situation is usually required to master grammatical structures, especially those which differ from structures in the student's native language.

To check the student's level of grammatical control, the interviewers will typically attempt to stimulate a discussion of topics which require or suggest the use of various verb moods, tenses, and persons beyond the simple narrative present and the first person ("I") forms. The accurate use of adjectives, adverbs, prepositions, and other aspects of language structure will also be evaluated in the course of the interview.

Vocabulary

The extent of the student's spoken vocabulary is noted throughout the course of the interview. Emphasis is placed on a wide-ranging vocabulary which allows the student to talk freely and accurately on a number of different topics, including but by no means restricted to vocabulary appropriate to his work assignment. The best preparation for the vocabulary aspect of the interview is not a last-minute study of word lists but rather the gradual and natural accumulation of vocabulary through classroom work together with extensive outside exposure to the language through films, conversations with native speakers or more advanced students, and so forth.

Fluency

Fluency does not refer here to the absolute speed of delivery, since native speakers of any language often show wide variation in this area. Fluency, for purposes of the interview, refers to the overall smoothness, continuity, and naturalness of the student's speech, as opposed to pauses for rephrasing sentences, groping for words, and so forth.

Listening Comprehension

It is difficult to evaluate listening comprehension in a highly objective manner using a conversational technique. If a student is able to carry out a rather sophisticated conversation on the basis of spoken leads and comments given by the interviewer, it is reasonably certain that the student has acquired a listening comprehension proficiency at least up to the level represented by the general nature of the conversation. It is, however, possible that the student's listening proficiency as such could be quite high, but that limitations in his ability to speak the language would prevent him from responding readily to questions or conversational leads which he understood perfectly well. Plans are currently being made to develop a test of listening comprehension for Peace Corps use which would be administered independently of the language proficiency interview to provide additional information about this area of the student's language competence. In the meanwhile, students' listening comprehension ability will continue to be judged, albeit somewhat roughly, on the basis of the face-to-face interview. The interviewers are instructed to give the benefit of the doubt to the student, and to assume as a matter of course that his listening proficiency is at least on a level with his interview performance.

Interview Scoring and Interpretation

The language proficiency interview is unlike most tests in that it does not yield a numerical score based on the number of questions answered correctly. Rather, the results of the interview are reported on the basis of discrete categories of overall performance. Descriptions of these categories are as follows:

Category 1

Able to satisfy routine travel needs and minimum courtesy requirements. Can ask and answer questions on topics very familiar to him; within the scope of his very limited language experience can understand simple questions and statements, allowing for slowed speech, repetition or paraphrase; speaking vocabulary inadequate to express anything but the most elementary needs; errors in pronunciation and grammar are frequent, but can be understood by a native speaker used to dealing with foreigners attempting to speak his language. While elementary needs vary considerably from individual to individual, any person at the Category 1 level should be able to order a simple meal, ask for shelter or lodging, ask and give simple directions, make purchases, and tell time.

Category 2

Able to satisfy routine social demands and limited work requirements. Can handle with confidence but not with facility most social situations including introductions and casual conversations about current events, as well as work, family, and autobiographical information; can handle limited work requirements, needing help in handling any complications or difficulties; can get the gist of most conversations on non-technical subjects (i.e. topics which require no specialized knowledge) and has a speaking vocabulary sufficient to express himself simply with some circumlocutions; accent, though often quite faulty, is intelligible; can usually handle elementary constructions quite accurately but does not have thorough or confident control of the grammar.

Category 3

Able to speak the language with sufficient structural accuracy and vocabulary to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, and professional topics. Can discuss particular interests and special fields of competence with reasonable ease; comprehension is quite complete for a normal rate of speech; vocabulary is broad enough that he rarely has to grope for a word; accent may be obviously foreign; control of grammar good; errors never interfere with understanding and rarely disturb the native speaker.

Category 4

Able to use the language fluently and accurately on all levels normally pertinent to professional needs. Can understand and participate in any conversation within the range of his experience with a high degree of fluency and precision of vocabulary; would rarely be taken for a native speaker, but can respond appropriately even in unfamiliar situations; errors of pronunciation and grammar quite rare; can handle informal interpreting from and into the language.

Category 5

Speaking proficiency equivalent to that of an educated native speaker. Has complete fluency in the language such that his speech on all levels is fully accepted by educated native speakers in all of its features, including breadth of vocabulary and idiom, colloquialisms, and pertinent cultural references.

Ideally, the best sort of "score report" for a student whose interview performance fell into one of the above categories would be to present verbatim the entire verbal description of that category. For obvious clerical reasons, it is more efficient simply to report the category number corresponding to the verbal description. This "shorthand" procedure has two potential drawbacks of which both students and Peace Corps staff should be aware. The first is the tendency for a person to forget the verbal definitions corresponding to the numerical categories, and to deal with the numbers according to some private—and possibly erroneous—notion about what the numbers mean. The second is to assume that because the interview results are expressed as a set of continuous numbers there is a straightforward and uniform increase in student performance from one category rating to another, for example, that the amount of student improvement represented by a score increase from "2" to "3" is the same amount of improvement as that represented by an increase from "3" to "4." On the contrary (as can be seen by referring to the verbal descriptions), the amount of student work and improvement required to go from one category to another generally increases with each higher category. Thus, the transition from category "1" to category "2" could probably be made by a student who over a period of several weeks succeeded in establishing a reasonably consistent control of basic grammar and who in addition acquired a workable but not especially extensive vocabulary for his work area and for other general topics. The transition from "2" to "3," on the other hand, would probably require conscientious training in and practice of most grammatical patterns to a point at which they could be produced almost automatically. The vocabulary expectations would also be considerably increased for both breadth and depth, and considerations of fluency and pronunciation accuracy would assume greater prominence. A category increase from "3" to "4" would require a close approximation of native standards for the various rating factors; thus, language precision at the "4" level could probably not be attained during the regular Peace Corps training program unless the student were unusually proficient in the language before entering the program.

In summary of the above, while the student just beginning the language could reasonably hope for proficiency increases of one or possibly two categories up to about the "2" or in some cases "3" level, a higher category would not usually be reached because of the substantially greater increases in amount and quality of mastery associated with these levels.

	S-1	S-2	S-3	S-4	S-5
Pronunciation	Often unintelligible	Usually foreign but rarely unintelligible	Sometimes Foreign but always intelligible	Sometimes foreign but always intelligible	Native
Grammar	Accuracy limited to set expressions; almost no control of syntax; often conveys wrong information	Fair control of most basic syntactic patterns; conveys meaning accurately in simple sentences most of time	Good control of most basic syntactic patterns; always conveys meaning accurately in reasonably complex sentences	Makes only occasional errors, and these show no pattern of deficiency	Control equal to that of an educated native speaker
Vocabulary	Adequate only for survival, travel, and basic courtesy needs	Adequate for simple social conversation and routine school needs	Adequate for participation in all general conversation and for discussions in a special field	Professional and general vocabulary broad and precise, appropriate to occasion	Equal to vocabulary of an educated native speaker
Fluency	Except for memorized expressions, every utterance required enormous obvious effort	Usually hesitant; often forced to silence by limitations of grammar and vocabulary	Rarely hesitant; always able to sustain conversation through circumlocutions	Speech on all professional matters as apparently effortless as in English; always easy to listen to	Speech at least as fluent as in English on all occasions
Comprehension	May require much repetition, slow rate of speech; understands only very simple, short familiar utterances	In general understands non-technical speech directed to him, but sometimes misinterprets or needs utterances reworded. Usually cannot follow conversation between native speakers	Understands most of what is said to him; can follow speeches, clear radio broadcasts, and most conversation between native speakers, but not in great detail	Can understand all educated speech in any moderately clear context; occasionally baffled by colloquialisms and regionalisms	Equal to that of the native speaker

APPENDIX E

Program Personnel

Bettye Paltridge
800 Brooklawn
Boulder, Colorado, 80303 (494-5227)

Peter Callas Panayot
922 12th Street
Boulder, Colorado, 80302 (442-7610)

Deborah Anderson
2111 Spruce #1
Boulder, Colorado, 80302 (449-8299)

Anthony Lopez
c/o Lafayette Middle School
Lafayette, Colorado, 80026

Charles Stansfield, Evaluator
1475 Folsom, Apt. 182
Boulder, Colorado, 80302 (443-4140)

Roger Martinez, Coordinator
Boulder Valley Public Schools
P.O. Box 9011
Boulder, Colorado, 80302 (447-1010)

END

DEPT. OF HEW

NAT'L INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

ERIC

DATE FILMED

MAR.4 77